

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 ALDEN A. THOMAS, SR.,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 v.

10 SUNSHINE CARE HOME, et al.,

11 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:16-CV-2601 JCM (PAL)

ORDER

12
13 Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Leen's report and recommendation (R&R)
14 to dismiss petitioner Alden A. Thomas Sr.'s motion of registration of judgment from another
15 district with prejudice and to deny the application to proceed in forma pauperis as moot. (ECF
16 No. 9). Petitioner filed a timely objection. (ECF No. 10). Defendants have not filed a response,
17 and the time for doing so has since passed.

18 Also before the court is petitioner's motion for judgment. (ECF No. 11). Defendants have
19 not filed a response, and the time for doing so has since passed.

20 Also before the court is petitioner's motion for leave to file a supplemental brief in response
21 to Magistrate Judge Leen's R&R. (ECF No. 12).

22 This court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
23 recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party fails to object to a
24 magistrate judge's report and recommendation, however, the court is not required to conduct "any
25 review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140,
26 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review
27 a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See United*
28 *States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review

1 employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no
2 objections were made); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003)
3 (reading the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Reyna–Tapia* as adopting the view that district courts are
4 not required to review “any issue that is not the subject of an objection.”).

5 Plaintiff filed a timely objection to the report and recommendation. Therefore, this court
6 finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to determine whether to adopt the
7 recommendation of the magistrate judge. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Petitioner’s objections do
8 not address—and thus cannot overcome—the fact that the judgment he attempts to register appears
9 to be from a court that does not exist. Indeed, the magistrate judge appropriately cites to *Daniels-*
10 *Hall v. National Education Association*, Federal Rule of Evidence 201, and the website for the
11 United States Courts in determining that there is no such thing as a federal “adjudicator court” in
12 California. 629 F.3d 992, 998–99 (9th Cir. 2010); *see also* (ECF Nos. 5, 9). Therefore, this court
13 agrees with the magistrate judge’s analysis and conclusion.

14 Accordingly,

15 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Magistrate Judge Leen’s
16 R&R (ECF No. 9) be, and the same hereby is, ADOPTED in its entirety.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner’s motion for judgment (ECF No. 11) be, and
18 the same hereby is, DENIED as moot.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner’s motion for leave to file a supplemental brief
20 (ECF No. 12) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

21 The clerk shall enter judgment accordingly and close the case.

22 DATED April 5, 2018.

23 
24 _____
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE